

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In this response, no claims have been amended, canceled or added to the application. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-5, 7 and 10 are pending in the application. No new matter has been added.

In the prior Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-5, 7 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Daitch et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,447,991 B1, in view of Lee et al., U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. US2002/0094318 A1, and further in view of Chattopadhyay et al., U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. US2004/0156911 A1. For the reasons set forth below, applicant requests reconsideration of the claim rejections.

Daitch et al. discloses a method for producing an aerogel material that is doped with a special bioaffinity compound. In accordance with the Daitch et al. method, a solution (also known as a "sol"), which comprises a silicate monomer (tetraethoxysilane), ethanol, water and a catalyst, undergoes partial hydrolysis and condensation to form a "gel" (because this particular sol includes ethanol, which is an alcohol, Daitch et al. also refers to the "gel" material as an "alcogel"). The "gel" consists of a solid silicate network that is soaking in the ethanol solution. Daitch et al. teaches that a dopant can be added to the alcogel, which reacts with silanol groups on the solid silicate network of the gel. Daitch et al. teaches that the ethanol solution, which the Examiner refers to as both the "second material" and the "liquid phase", is removed by a supercritical fluid drying process. The Examiner admits that the resulting material is not in particle form. In fact, the Daitch et al. process produces a porous body or matrix of doped silicate material.

In an attempt to overcome the deficiencies in the teachings of Daitch et al. (i.e., the failure of Daitch et al. to teach the extraction of the second material from composite particles as claimed), the Examiner cites Lee et al. As noted by the Examiner, Lee et al. teaches a process for preparing highly porous, low density micron-sized aerogel particles via a sol-gel process that is very similar to that which is disclosed by Daitch et al. The Examiner contends that Lee et al. teaches that which is missing from Daitch et al., namely the use of supercritical fluid for the purpose of extracting a second material from composite particles. On this point, the Examiner is clearly mistaken.

Lee et al. does disclose a sol-gel process that is very similar to that taught by Daitch et al. At col. 4, lines 42-59, Lee et al. teaches that the production of aerogels involves a sol-gel process during which a wet gel containing the substance of interest is formed with a proper solvent and catalyst. After the wet gel with nano-sized pores and a lattice structure has been formed, a supercritical extraction process is used to supercritically dry the gel while avoid potential collapse of the delicate pore and lattice structure. The Examiner is apparently under the belief that the "delicate pore and lattice structure" from which the solvent is extracted using a supercritical fluid in the process according to Lee et al. is a composite particle having a dimension up to about 2 microns. This is incorrect. Lee et al. clearly explains that in order to obtain particles, aerogel material must be milled. Lee et al. states this in col. 3, lines 32-34 ("In both embodiments the resulting aerogels are then milled to the desired final particle size.") and in col. 7 at lines 5-18 as follows:

Since the small particle size and high open porosity are critical for fast and even solubility in pulmonary surfactant and absorption at the mucous membrane, the initial aerogel bodies produced by any of the embodiments are comminuted in any suitable manner. Smaller particle diameters can be obtained while maintaining the porous structure by utilizing conventional methods such as impact milling, ball milling, and jet milling. Jet milling in a spiral jet mill has been found capable of producing particles as small as 0.5 micron without lattice destruction or a substantial decrease in open porosity or increase in density. Below a certain size, further reduction may not be warranted since the suspension and dissolving properties of the aerogel particles are so excellent.

Thus, the Examiner is mistaken that Lee et al. teaches a process whereby a second material that is soluble in supercritical fluid is extracted from a composite particle. In Lee et al., as in Daitch et al., a liquid is extracted from a wet gel using a supercritical fluid to produce an aerogel body. Lee et al. differs from Daitch et al. in that Lee et al. teaches that the resulting aerogel body should be milled to produce inhalable particles. But this is clearly different from that which is claimed in the present application.

Claims 1 and 10 of the present application specify that the second material extracted from the composite particles is a solid selected from the group consisting of

lipids, waxes, polymers, sugar acetates and fluorocarbons. This is clearly not taught by Daitch et al. or Lee et al., both of which utilize a supercritical fluid to extract a liquid solvent from a wet gel lattice structure. And this deficiency in the teachings of Daitch et al. and Lee et al. cannot be overcome via Chattopadhyay et al.

Chattopadhyay et al. discloses the use of supercritical carbon dioxide to extract a solvent from an emulsion. Chattopadhyay et al. does not teach the use of supercritical fluid for the purpose of extracting a second solid material from a composite particle to form porous particles as claimed. Thus, Chattopadhyay et al. cannot be relied upon to overcome the deficiencies in the teachings of Daitch et al. and Lee et al.

The process disclosed and claimed in the present application is not obvious in view of the processes disclosed in Daitch et al., Lee et al. and Chattopadhyay et al. None of the prior art processes of record involves contacting a composite particle comprising a first material and a second solid material selected from the group consisting of lipids, waxes, polymers, sugar acetates and fluorocarbons with a supercritical fluid to extract the second material and thereby form porous particles comprising the first material. Daitch et al. and Lee et al. disclose the use of a supercritical fluid to extract a liquid solution from a wet gel, thus producing a porous gel body, which Lee et al. teaches can be milled to form porous particles. And Chattopadhyay et al. teaches the use of a supercritical fluid to extract a solvent from an emulsion to produce particles. Applicant's invention is thus clearly patentable over the prior art of record.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy shown during the telephonic interview on October 27, 2009, during which the prior art (namely, Daitch et al. and Lee et al.) was briefly discussed. No agreement was reached regarding the allowability of the present claims in view of the prior art of record.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Application No. 10/552008  
Amendment dated October 30, 2009  
Reply to Office action of August 21, 2009

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge the same to Deposit Account No. 18-0160, Order No. FER-15618.001.001.

Respectfully submitted,

RANKIN, HILL & CLARK LLP

By: /Randolph E. Digges, III/  
Randolph E. Digges, III  
Reg. No. 40590

23755 Lorain Road, Suite 200  
North Olmsted, OH 44070  
TEL: (216) 566-9700  
FAX: (216) 566-9711  
[docketing@rankinhill.com](mailto:docketing@rankinhill.com)